

## **REMARKS**

### *Status of the Claims*

Claims 1 through 26 are pending in this application. Claims 1 through 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 20 and 26 have been amended to correct a misspelling. These amendments are not related to patentability. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, the Applicants traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and respectfully request reconsideration.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)*

Claims 1 – 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Shrivastava et al., (U.S. Pub. 2004/0243576 A1), (hereinafter referred to as “Shrivastava”).

Claim 1 recites a method for providing notifications of changes in a database system comprising:

creating a subscription template;  
parameterizing the subscription template to generate a  
parameter table; and  
**performing a join between said parameter table and  
said parameterized subscription template to generate a  
query.**

In order for a reference to anticipate claim 1, it must teach the entirety of the recited method including each and every recited element. The undersigned respectfully submits that Shrivastava does not teach the emphasized claim language and cannot possibly teach or even suggest the recited method.

The Office alleges that Shrivastava discloses the claimed method including “performing a join between said parameter table and said parameterized subscription template to generate a query.” In support of the rejection, the Office references the Abstract and paragraphs 11, 76 through 86, and 0185 through 0186. The undersigned respectfully requests reconsideration of the cited sections of Shrivastava.

Paragraphs 76 through 86 of Shrivastava disclose a system and method for automatically generating a query statement to search for particular objects or entries in a

directory information tree (“DIT”) that is stored within relational tables. (See Shrivastava, ¶ 76.) Shrivastava teaches using templates to convert an arbitrary LDAP search filter into a single SQL statement where a base template provides the basic framework for generating an SQL statement. (*Id.* at ¶ 78.) Additional templates are used to fill in specific portions of the base template. The LDAP is converted into a single SQL statement based upon the base template. (*Id.* at ¶ 79.)

The base template as disclosed by Shrivastava has three distinct sections, *id.* at ¶ 80; a header section, *see id.* at ¶ 81; a body section, *see id.* at ¶ 81; and a closing section, *see id.* at ¶ 85. In short, the referenced paragraphs 76 through 86 of Shrivastava disclose the structure of a base template for use in converting a search filter into an SQL statement. Nowhere in this cited section, or anywhere else in Shrivastava, is there a teaching of **“performing a join between the parameter table and the parameterized subscription template to generate a query”** as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner’s cite to paragraph 86 of Shrivastava does not cure the insufficiency of paragraphs 76 through 85. Paragraph 86 provides an explanation of the contents of the “closing section” of the base template taught by Shrivastava at paragraphs 76 through 85. Specifically, paragraph 86 explains that the “closing section” of the base template contains SQL statements that combine the results of the SQL statements from the body section of the template with rows from a data store and database table.

[0086] This portion of the base template contains SQL statements that **combine** the results of the SQL statements from the body section with particular rows from the attribute\_store and distinguished name tables. In addition, this portion of the base template contains statements to filter and order/sort the results of the search query. (emphasis added).

Undeniably, paragraph 86 of Shrivastava does not mention “performing a join” as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Office Action does not articulate how “combin[ing] . . . results . . . with particular rows” as recited by Shrivastava is the same as **“performing a join between the parameter table and the parameterized subscription template to generate a query.”** The undersigned respectfully submits that the juxtaposition of paragraph 61 of the present application with a quote to paragraph 86 of Shrivastava as appears at page 2 of the Office Action does not provide a useful explanation for the basis for the Office’s reasoning.

Even assuming for the purpose of argument that “combin[ing] . . . results . . . with particular rows” as taught by Shrivastava is the same as “performing a join” as recited in claim 1, the balance of the recited claim language is not taught or disclosed by Shrivastava. Namely, there is no teaching of “performing a join **between the parameter table and the parameterized subscription template to generate a query.**”

Paragraphs 185 and 186 of Shrivastava, also referenced by the Office Action, do not teach or suggest “performing a join between the parameter table and the parameterized subscription template to generate a query.” Paragraph 185 mentions “a join and/or union operation,” but it does not teach or suggest “performing a join . . . to generate a query” as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Shrivastava’s use of the word “join” in paragraph 185 illustrates that the use of the word “combine” in paragraph 86 was meant to convey something other than performing a join. Had the author of Shrivastava meant to describe performing a “join” in connection with paragraph 86, the author was aware of the term and could have used it. Clearly, the author did not use this language and wished to communicate something different by describing “combin[ing] . . . results . . . with particular rows.”

Therefore, because it does not teach all of the recited language, Shrivastava does not anticipate claim 1 and dependent claims 2 through 9. Independent claims 10, 11, 20, and 26, and all claims depending therefrom are likewise not anticipated by Shrivastava for analogous reasons. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully solicited.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-1795/303912.01  
**Application No.:** 10/608,298  
**Office Action Dated:** June 13, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

### **CONCLUSION**

The undersigned respectfully submits that pending claims are allowable and the application in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Examiner Muhebbulah is invited to call the undersigned in the event a telephone interview will advance prosecution of this application.

Date: August 13, 2007

/John E. McGlynn/  
John E. McGlynn  
Registration No. 42,863

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439